



Opened by G.W. Smalley
Not read

May 21, 1851

Oliver Johnson, Esq.,
Anti-Slavery Office,
48 Beekman Street,
New York City, N.Y.

1050
MAY 21

N.6 #109

Boston, May 21, 1865.

Dear Johnson:

I am obliged to you for your letter. Your valediction in the last Standard is written with precision, dignity, and the force of truth. You need not have desired to have me by your side in preparing it. Your own quick instinct, clear insight and ready ability are always equal to the exigency of the hour. I regret that I shall not be able to print you farewell until ~~the~~ Liberator of June 2d. The proceedings of the Business Meetings will occupy two or three numbers of the Liberator, as we are limited as to the quantity of our Brevier type.

I am glad to see Mr. May's letter. It is frank, manly, and right to the point. But it (with your article) will certainly "raise a breeze" in a certain quarter, and you must both be prepared for sharp replications in the Standard.

Mr. May's resolution of thanks to
Mr. Quincy and yourself for your long and
invaluable services in conducting the Stand-
ard, which was sent to Coventry by a very
doubtful vote, and through unquestionable
misapprehension, will doubtless be adopted
by the late Executive Committee, and for-
warded to you both. I feel indignant,
but even more grieved than indignant,
at the suppression of that resolution by
a "side wind" at the business meeting.
But you need not have any doubt as to the
verdict of all unbiased minds in your
case.

I think Mr. May makes a telling
point against the new régime in re-
gard to using the money now in the treas-
ury of the American A. S. Society, raised
as it was by ladies who would assuredly
never have gone forward to collect a
dollar of it, had they anticipated such an
overturn in the management of the Society.

I am curious to see how the objection will be met by the Standard.

You announce that Mr. Pillsbury is to be your successor. This is just what I anticipated. Of one thing we may be sure — the tone of the paper will be any thing but jubilant in regard to the state of our good cause. Nevertheless, the heavens are bright, and all its omens cheering.

Does not our friend A. M. Powell owe it to the Society to explain how it happened that the very object of making a roll was defeated by his omission to check the names of those who voted, pro and con? It was an unaccountable blunder — for, knowing Aaron as I do, I cannot suppose it was an intentional act on his part. What was he thinking about?

How will you have your letters directed hereafter?

Faithfully and always yours,
W^m. Lloyd Garrison.

P. S. My dear wife went to Providence on Friday, to be placed under the treatment of Dr. Joseph Dow, 72 High Street. She will probably remain there two or three months.